UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/993,877	11/05/2001	Hakan Ozdemir	99-S-190 (1678-22-1)	8286
	7590 02/23/200 CTRONICS, INC.	EXAMINER		
MAIL STATION 2346			MERCEDES, DISMERY E	
1310 ELECTRONICS DRIVE CARROLLTON, TX 75006			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2627	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/23/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/993,877	OZDEMIR, HAKAN	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DISMERY E. MERCEDES	2627	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeariod for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tind will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed  the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09</u> This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ The 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	nis action is non-final. vance except for formal matters, pr		
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdr 5) ☐ Claim(s) 5-7 and 29-31 is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-4,8-28 and 32 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and.  Application Papers	rawn from consideration.		
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examir 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 07 February 2002 is/a  Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the B	are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objecte ne drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ection is required if the drawing(s) is ob	ne 37 CFR 1.85(a). Dijected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority docume 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority docume 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicat iority documents have been receiv au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5)  Notice of Informal I 6)  Other:	ate	

Application/Control Number: 09/993,877 Page 2

Art Unit: 2627

## **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/9/2008 has been entered.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
   The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 3. Claims 2,4,6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which applicant(s) regard as their invention.
- 4. Claims 2,4,6 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Note: rejection applies to any subsequent dependent claims.

Claim 2, recites the limitation "sector includes a track"; claim 4, recites the limitation "data sector comprises tracks" and claim 6, recites the limitation "disk sectors comprise tracks", however it is well known in the art that a track comprises sectors. Please make the necessary corrections.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claim 1-4, 8-28,32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Turtle et al. (US 5,796,535).

As to Claim 1, Turtle et al. discloses a storage disk, comprising: a disk sector having a beginning and operable to store data (fig.2A-2b); and a servo wedge located at the beginning of the sector, the servo wedge having a portion that does not include a zero-frequency field and that is detectable during a spin-up of the disk without a prior detection of a zero-frequency field (fig.2B, preamble located at the beginning of the sector and does not include zero-frequency field and detectable during spin up of the disk without a detection of a zero-frequency field), and the servo wedge operable to provide an initial position of a read-write head relative to the disk after detection of the portion (col.4, lines 25-41).

As to Claim 2, Turtle et al. further discloses the sector includes a track that is operable to store the data; and the servo wedge is operable to provide the initial position of the read-write head by identifying the track and is operable to identify the track during a subsequent read of the data from or write of the data to the track (col.4, lines 25-26 and 34-38).

As to claim 3, Turtle et al. discloses a disk comprising data sectors; servo wedges each detectable by a read head upon initial spin-up and identifying a respective data sector; and no zero-frequency spin-up fields associated with the servo wedges (figs.2A-2B, col.4, lines 25-41 and 51-54).

As to Claim 4, Turtle et al. further discloses the data sectors comprise tracks (fig.2A); and each servo wedge identifies and is located in a respective track (fig.2B each servo wedge is located and identifies a respective track-col.4, lines 34-36).

As to Claim 8, Turtle et al. discloses a storage disk comprising disk sectors operable to store data; servo wedges located in the disk sectors and each having a respective location identifiers, respective position bursts, and a respective other portions, the other portions of each servo wedge substantially the same as the other portions of all the other servo wedges and detectable during an initial read-write head positioning; and no zero-frequency spin-up fields (see figs.2A-2B and col.4, lines 25-50).

As to Claim 9-11, Turtle et al. further discloses wherein the other portions of each servo wedge include a preamble (as per claim 10) a synch mark (as per claim 11) a servo address mark (fig.2B and col.4, lines 28-37, 39-40).

As to Claim 12, Turtle et al. further discloses wherein the location identifier of each servo wedge is different from the location of another servo wedge (col.4, lines 34-36 wherein the gray code information is different from another servo wedge).

As to Claim 13, Turtle et al. further discloses wherein position bursts each servo wedge is different from the position bursts of another servo wedge (col.4, lines 42-46- wherein the bursts are located at precise intervals and locations with respect to the various (different) locations of the centerlines).

As to Claims 25-28 are method claims drawn to the apparatus of claims 1-4, and are rejected for the same reasons of anticipation as set forth in the rejection of claims 1-4, above.

As to Claim 32, has the same limitations as to those treated in the rejection of claim 1, and are met by the reference as discussed above.

As to Claim 14, has limitations similar to those treated in the rejection of claim 1 and are met by the reference as discussed above. Claim 14, however also recites the following limitations further met by Turtle et al.: a data-storage disk having a surface, data sectors at respective locations of the

surface, and servo wedges that each include respective servo data that identifies the location of a respective data sector; a motor coupled to and operable to rotate the disk; a read head operable to generate a read signal that represents the servo data and having a position with respect to the surface of the data-storage disk; a read-head positioning circuit operable to move the read head over the surface of the disk; and a servo circuit coupled to the read head and to the read-head positioning system, the servo circuit including, a servo channel operable to recover the servo data from the read signal, and a processor coupled to the servo channel and operable to detect one of the servo wedges while or after the disk attains an operating speed but before the servo channel recovers servo data from any other of the servo wedges (see figs.2-3 and 14 and col.4, lines 25-50 and col.15, line 35-60, wherein while at a steady speed the detection of servo wedge is performed, but before obtaining the head positioning information).

As to claim 15, Tuttle et al. further discloses the servo channel is operable to recover the servo data from the detected servo wedge; and the servo circuit is operable to, determine an initial position of the read head from the recovered servo data, and provide the initial position to the readhead positioning circuit (see fig.2b-3, col.4, lines 25-50).

As to claim 16, Tuttle et al. further discloses wherein the servo channel is operable to recover the servo data from the detected servo wedge and to provide the location of the respective data sector to the read-head positioning circuit (see fig.2, wherein the location of the data sector can be obtained from the servo data "3").

As to claim 17 Tuttle et al. further discloses the servo channel is operable to recover the servo data from the detected servo wedge and to provide the location of the respective data sector to the read-head positioning circuit; and the read-head positioning circuit is operable to determine

an initial position of the read head from the location of the respective data sector (see fig.2b and col.4, lines 25-50).

As to claim 18 Tuttle et al. further discloses wherein the read-head position circuit and the servo circuit are unable to determine the position of the read head before the processor detects the one servo wedge (see fig.2b, col.4, lines 25-50 and col.14, lines 35-39--w positioning information of the read head is obtained through reading the data of the servo wedge)

As to claim 19 Tuttle et al. further discloses wherein the read head comprises a read-write head (see fig.2b and col.4, line 13).

As to Claims 20-24 have the same limitations as to those treated in the rejection of claims 14-19 and are met by the reference as discussed in the rejection of claims 14-19 above.

# Allowable Subject Matter

## 3. Claims 5-7, 29-31, are allowed.

Independent claim 5 is allowable over the prior art since the cited references taken alone or in combination do not teach or suggest: servo wedges detectable without a zero-frequency field upon an initial spin-up located in the disk sectors and each having a pre-synchronization-mark section with substantially the same bit pattern and length as the pre-synchronization-mark section of the other servo wedges; and no servo wedge having a pre-synchronization-mark section with a significantly different bit pattern or a significantly different length as compared to the pre-synchronization-mark section of the other servo wedges, in combination with the other limitations in the claim.

Independent claim 29 is allowable over the prior art since the cited references taken alone or in combination do not teach or suggest: writing a second servo wedge onto the surface of the data-storage disk to define a second disk sector that is operable to store file data, the second servo wedge including third servo data that is

operable to identify the second disk sector before a read of file data from or a write of file data to the second disk sector, in combination with the other limitations in the claim.

Independent claim 30 is allowable over the prior art since the cited references taken alone or in combination do not teach or suggest: writing a second servo wedge onto the surface of the data-storage disk to define a second disk sector that is operable to store file data, the second servo wedge including second servo data that is operable to identify the second disk sector during a read of file data from or a write of file to the second disk sector and wherein the second servo data is operable to identify the second disk sector during the initial positioning of the head over the disk, in combination with the other limitations in the claim.

Independent claim 31 is allowable over the prior art since the cited references taken alone or in combination do not teach or suggest: writing a second servo wedge onto the surface of the data-storage disk to define a second disk sector that is operable to store file data, the second servo wedge including second servo data that is operable to identify the second disk sector during a read of file data from or a write of file to the second disk sector and wherein the second servo data is unable to identify the second disk sector during the initial positioning of the head over the disk, in combination with the other limitations in the claim.

#### Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Hetzler et al. (US 5,523,903); Greenberg et al. (US 5,596,460); Ahn (US 6,259,577); Dunbar (US 6,525,892); Lee (US 6,108,150).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DISMERY E. MERCEDES whose telephone number is (571)272-7558. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, from 9:00am - 4:00pm.

Application/Control Number: 09/993,877 Page 8

Art Unit: 2627

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hoa Thi Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-7579. The fax phone number for the organization

where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system,

see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system,

contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like

assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Dismery E. Mercedes/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2627